

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Jascha Franklin-Hodge  
FROM: Alex Lawrence  
CC: Matt Mayrl, Georges Hawat, Paul Kresser, Chris Osgood, Alice Santigo, Lihn Young, Kevin Parker, Johanna Bernstein  
DATE: October, 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
RE: Improving Online Permitting and Licensing RFP#: EV00001595  
Chronology of selection activity & request to enter into contract negotiations

---

### **Chronology of Activity**

August 12, 2014	RFP Available
August 27, 2014, 1:00 pm	Pre-Bid Conference
August 27, 2014	Questions Due to the City
September 3, 2014	City Responses to Questions Posted
September 17, 2014, Noon	Proposal Deadline
September 17th - October 24	Vendor Demos Reference Checks Review of technical portion of RFP Review of pricing portion of RFP

### **Synopsis of Activity**

- When RFP was advertised, two different RFP evaluation committees were formed.  
**Technical Evaluation Committee membership:** Matt Mayrl, Georges Hawat, Paul Kresser, Chris Osgood, Alice Santigo, Lihn Young,  
**Pricing Evaluation Committee membership:** Kevin Parker, Johanna Bernstein, Alex Lawrence
- RFP was posted on the City of Boston's website, as well as respondent questions and city answers. ([www.cityofboston.gov/procurement](http://www.cityofboston.gov/procurement))
- 10 vendors responded to the RFP by submitting proposals electronically.
  - Accela Inc.
  - Aeon Nexus Corp.
  - Applied Technical Systems, Inc.
  - AvePoint Public Sector
  - Creative Information Technology (CITI)
  - Labyrinth Solutions Inc (LSI)
  - McKinsey and Company Inc.
  - PCC Technology Group
  - Vermonster

**Result:** Nine out of ten responses were deemed complete and were forwarded to the selection committees (Technical & Pricing) for further review and evaluation. Vermonster was disqualified

for consideration as their proposal did not meet minimum evaluation criteria due to not including completed signed copies of CB Form 7: Non-Collusion Certificate.

### **Technical Evaluation**

- The Technical Evaluation Committee met several times between September 17th and October 22nd.

Result: The group gave each proposal a ranking for each criteria listed in the RFP as Highly Advantageous (HA), Advantageous (A) or Not Advantageous (NA).

### **Ratings of Proposals by Technical Committee**

	CITI	LSI	Avepoint	Viewpoint	AeonNexus	Accela	McKinsey	ATS	PCC
Org Profile	NA	HA	NA	A	NA	HA	HA	A	A
Project Proposal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	HA	HA	A	A
Easy and Clear	NA	A	NA	A	NA	HA	HA	A	A
Integration	NA	A	NA	A	NA	HA	HA	A	A
Dependable	HA	A	A	A	A	HA	HA	HA	HA
Ownership	NA	HA	NA	NA	NA	A	A	HA	A
Ever Improving	A	A	NA	NA	NA	HA	HA	HA	NA

Based on these ratings, the group asked the top 4 rated proposals: Accela, McKinsey, ATS, and PCC to provide a vendor demonstration. Based on these presentations and the ratings, the group determined Accela and McKinsey to be the best overall proposals.

### **Pricing Analysis**

- Independently, the Pricing Evaluation Committee reviewed the pricing for all of the respondents. The group worked to standardize pricing estimates and determined the following rankings:

### **Vendor Ranking - Lowest to Highest Cost**

Total "Not To Exceed" Amount		Total Including 3-Year Maintenance Option	
Viewpoint	\$ 390,000	Viewpoint	\$ 480,000
Accela	\$ 970,625	Accela	\$ 1,216,875
CITI	\$ 1,583,160	LSI	\$ 1,695,200
LSI	\$ 1,635,200	CITI	\$ 1,820,634
PCC	\$ 2,930,000	PCC	\$ 3,050,000
AvePoint	\$ 3,800,000	AvePoint	\$ 4,961,208
McKinsey	\$ 5,983,425	McKinsey	\$ 6,230,425
ATS	\$ 6,785,828	ATS	\$ 7,635,102

### **Technical & Pricing Committee Joint Recommendation**

- Given the significant difference in pricing of the technical committees two highly rated, both committees jointly agreed that Accela was the most preferred proposal.

### **Recommendation**

After careful consideration of both the technical merits and costs, by each respective committee, your approval is requested to award the work as outlined in Improving Online Permitting and Licensing RFP#: EV00001595 to Accela.